UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,525	10/21/2005	Nicholas P. De Luca	D-30335-01	6004

7590 12/08/2009

Daniel B Ruble
Sealed Air Corporation
Law Department
Post Office Box 464
Duncan, SC 29334

EXAMINER	
WU, VICKI H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1791	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/532,525	DE LUCA, NICHOLAS P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VICKI WU	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/15/2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-20,40-47,56 and 57* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-39 and 48-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *4/25/2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :10/21/2005, 2/21/2006, 2/22/2006, 3/23/2007, 10/14/2009.

DETAILED ACTION

This is a non-final Office action in response to the claims submitted on 07/15/2009.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group III (claims 21-39, 48-55) in the reply filed on 03/10/2009 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose).

Regarding claim 21, Ambrose teaches a machine for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material (Figure 1; col. 4 lines 4-6), the machine comprising:

a conveyor (by definition, a mechanical arrangement for transporting material or objects, generally over short or moderate distances) adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (32, Figure 2; col. 4 lines 33-37); and

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 5 lines 6-12).

Regarding claim 22, Ambrose teaches that said conveyor is adapted to movably support the sheet stock (col. 4 lines 33-37); and

the machine further comprises one or more cutting heads movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into the discrete sheets (78, Figures 18 and 19; col. 5 lines 37-43).

Regarding claim 23, Ambrose teaches a computerized controller for controlling the movements of the conveyor, the one or more cutting heads, and the platform (col. 4 lines 24-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 21-23, 26-29, 31, 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose).

Regarding claim 21, Feygin teaches a machine comprising:

a conveyor adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (37, Figure 1; col. 4 lines 16-24); and

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (130, Figure 1; col. 8 lines 1-5):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (58, Figure 1; col. 8 lines 1-5); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 8 lines 13-17).

Feygin does not expressly disclose that said machine is for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material. Ambrose teaches a machine for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material (Figure 1; col. 4 lines 4-6), the machine comprising:

a conveyor (by definition, a mechanical arrangement for transporting material or objects, generally over short or moderate distances) adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (32, Figure 2; col. 4 lines 33-37); and

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 5 lines 6-12).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the specific functions of the machine of Ambrose to modify the apparatus of Feygin. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided

by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific functions of Ambrose; that in applying said specific functions, the resulting machine may manufacture very desirable, delicate articles, and in a manner that is very suitable for automated production (Ambrose: col. 1 lines 18-28).

Regarding claim 22, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that said conveyor is adapted to movably support the sheet stock (col. 4 lines 16-18); and

the machine further comprises one or more cutting heads (72, Figure 1) movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into the discrete sheets (col. 5 lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 23, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches a computerized controller for controlling the movements of the conveyor, the one or more cutting heads, and the platform (24, Figure 1; col. 3 lines 56-60).

Regarding claim 26, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the machine further comprises an adhesion station upstream from the platform and adapted to apply an adhesive to the discrete sheets (col. 8 lines 13-17).

Regarding claim 27, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the machine further comprises a heating station upstream from the platform and adapted to heat the discrete sheets (col. 8 lines 13-20; col. 9 lines 66-67; col. 10 lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 28, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that said one or more cutting heads comprise:

a first set of one or more cutting heads, a laser and a mirror capable of directing the laser beam (72 and 74, Figure 2; col. 5 lines 18-29) movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut inner scrap cutouts from the sheet stock supported by the conveyor (78, Figure 2; col. 5 lines 40-44, 50-60); and

a second set of one or more cutting heads, a set of mirrors capable of directing the laser beam, movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut inner scrap cutouts from the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (76 and 77, Figure 2; col. 5 lines 18-29).

Regarding claim 29, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches a vacuum head adapted to lift the inner scrap cutouts from the conveyor (col. 5 lines 65-66; col. 11 line 67; col. 12 lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 31, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the one or more cutting heads are movably supported above the conveyor by rails (52a, 52b, Figures 1 and 2; col. 2 lines 19-22; col. 4 lines 33-35).

Regarding claim 33, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the one or more cutting heads comprises a plurality of cutting heads (a set of mirrors capable of directing the laser beam) (76 and 77, Figure 2; col. 5 lines 18-29).

Regarding claim 34, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the plurality of cutting heads are adapted to cut multiple sheets of the same shape oriented perpendicular to the direction of travel of the conveyor (col. 11 lines 26-27).

Regarding claim 35, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the platform movable upwardly toward the conveyor to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets between the platform and the conveyor to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 7 lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 36, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the platform further comprises a conveyor (by definition, a mechanical arrangement for transporting material or objects, generally over short or moderate distances) (col. 7 lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 37, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches the machine further comprising a sheet stock feeding system upstream of the conveyor (30, Figure 2; col. 3 lines 63-66).

Regarding claim 38, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the sheet stock feeding system is adapted to supply a continuous sheet of sheet stock of cushioning material to the conveyor (col. 4 lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 39, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the sheet stock feeding system is adapted to supply individual portions of sheet stock of cushioning material to the conveyor (36, Figure 2; col. 4 lines 1-4).

Claims 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose) and in further view of US Patent 5,651,237 (De Luca).

Regarding claims 24, 25, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the conveyor is adapted to movably support the sheet stock (col. 4 lines 16-18);

the machine further comprises one or more cutting heads (72, Figures 1 and 2; col. 5 lines 18-21) movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into the discrete sheets (col. 5 lines 40-44); and

the conveyor comprises a vacuum (col. 11 line 67; col. 12 lines 1-3). Feygin in view of Ambrose does not expressly disclose that said conveyor comprises a vacuum conveyor.

De Luca teaches an analogous machine for packaging items within inflatable packages (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 3 lines 1-2) comprising a conveyor (5, Figure 1) that may employ a vacuum (15, Figure 1; col. 4 lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the specific vacuum conveyor of De Luca with the conveyor of Feygin in view of Ambrose in order to modify the machine of Feygin in view of Ambrose. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific conveyor of De Luca; that said specific conveyor of De Luca may help make the overall system more simple to use for the consumer, and more integratable in a high-speed in-line packaging process (De Luca: col. 2 lines 40-48).

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose) and in further view of Cutting Specialists (CS).

Regarding claim 30, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the second set of one or more cutting heads is downstream from the first set of one or more cutting heads (76 and 77, Figure 2; col. 5 lines 18-29); and

the vacuum head (184 and 186, Figure 2; col. 11 line 67; col. 12 lines 1-3) is downstream from the first set of one or more cutting heads (Figure 2).

Feygin in view of Ambrose does not expressly disclose that said vacuum head is located upstream from the second set of one or more cutting heads. CS teaches mounting a vacuum head directly adjacent to a laser cutting head (pgs. 2, 3: "Laser Cutting Head" paragraph; "Routing Tool Head" paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the vacuum head configuration of CS in order to modify the apparatus of Feygin in view of Ambrose (and therefore said head would be located upstream from the second set of one or more cutting heads of Feygin in view of Ambrose). The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the advantages to incorporating said specific vacuum head configuration of CS; that in using said configuration, dust and debris generated from cutting the layers are efficiently eliminated (CS: pgs. 2, 3: "Routing Tool Head" paragraph: "The addition of a high-efficiency vacuum manifold that is mounted precisely at the cutting point meant that almost all of the cutting debris was captured immediately after it was generated").

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose) and in further view of ThomasNet: "Stainless Steel Waterjet Cutting Services" (ThomasNet).

Regarding claim 32, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the one or more cutting heads may comprise a laser or a mechanical cutting knife (72, Figure 1; col. 5 lines 44-

48). Feygin in view of Ambrose does not expressly disclose that said cutting heads comprise one or more water jet cutting heads. ThomasNet teaches using water jet cutting heads to cut die and laminated materials (pg. 2: Gardico, Inc. paragraph; pg. 3: Pegasus NW paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the water jet cutting heads of ThomasNet in order to modify the apparatus of Feygin in view of Ambrose. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the advantages to incorporating said water jet cutting heads; that said water jet cutting heads provide precise, accurate cuts, in even thick materials (ThomasNet: pg. 2: Pegasus NW paragraph, KV Technologies paragraph; pg. 4: Aqua Cut Technologies paragraph).

Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose).

Regarding claim 48, Feygin teaches a machine comprising:

a conveyor adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (37, Figure 1; col. 4 lines 16-24);

one or more cutting heads (72, Figure 1) movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (col. 5 lines 40-44, 50-60).

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (130, Figure 1; col. 8 lines 1-5):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (58, Figure 1; col. 8 lines 1-5); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 8 lines 13-17).

Feygin does not expressly disclose that said machine is for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material. Ambrose teaches a machine for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material (Figure 1; col. 4 lines 4-6), the machine comprising:

a conveyor (by definition, a mechanical arrangement for transporting material or objects, generally over short or moderate distances) adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (32, Figure 2; col. 4 lines 33-37); and

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 5 lines 6-12).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the specific functions of the machine of Ambrose to modify the apparatus of Feygin. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific functions of Ambrose; that in applying said specific functions, the resulting machine may manufacture very desirable, delicate articles, and in a manner that is very suitable for automated production (Ambrose: col. 1 lines 18-28).

Regarding claim 49, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the platform and conveyor are moveable relative each other to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets between the platform and the conveyor to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 7 lines 54-57).

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose) and in further view of US Patent 5,651,237 (De Luca).

Regarding claim 50, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the conveyor is adapted to movably support the sheet stock (col. 4 lines 16-18);

the machine further comprises one or more cutting heads (72, Figures 1 and 2; col. 5 lines 18-21) movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into the discrete sheets (col. 5 lines 40-44); and

the conveyor comprises a vacuum (col. 11 line 67; col. 12 lines 1-3). Feygin in view of Ambrose does not expressly disclose that said conveyor comprises a vacuum conveyor.

De Luca teaches an analogous machine for packaging items within inflatable packages (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 3 lines 1-2) comprising a conveyor (5, Figure 1) that may employ a vacuum (15, Figure 1; col. 4 lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the specific vacuum conveyor of De Luca with the conveyor of Feygin in view of Ambrose in order to modify the machine of Feygin in view of Ambrose. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific conveyor of De Luca; that said specific conveyor of De Luca may help make the overall system more simple to use for the consumer, and more integratable in a high-speed in-line packaging process (De Luca: col. 2 lines 40-48).

Claims 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose).

Regarding claim 51, Feygin teaches a machine comprising:

a plurality of cutting heads (a set of mirrors capable of directing the laser beam) (72, 74, Figure 2; col. 5 lines 18-29) movable transversely and longitudinally relative to the conveyor and adapted to cut the sheet stock supported by the conveyor into sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (col. 5 lines 40-44, 50-60);

a conveyor adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (37, Figure 1; col. 4 lines 16-24);

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (130, Figure 1; col. 8 lines 1-5):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (58, Figure 1; col. 8 lines 1-5); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 8 lines 13-17).

Feygin does not expressly disclose that said machine is for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material. Ambrose teaches a machine for making a packaging cushion insert from sheet stock of cushioning material (Figure 1; col. 4 lines 4-6), the machine comprising:

a conveyor (by definition, a mechanical arrangement for transporting material or objects, generally over short or moderate distances) adapted to movably support sequential discrete sheets of desired shapes (32, Figure 2; col. 4 lines 33-37); and

a platform below the conveyor adapted to receive the discrete sheets from the conveyor, wherein the platform and conveyor are moveable relative to each other (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10):

i) to place the discrete sheets in stacked arrangement on the platform when receiving the discrete sheets from the conveyor (64, Figures 2 and 10; col. 5 lines 6-10); and

ii) to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 5 lines 6-12).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the specific functions of the machine of Ambrose to modify the apparatus of Feygin. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the teaching of the advantages to using the specific functions of Ambrose; that in applying said specific functions, the resulting machine may manufacture very desirable, delicate articles, and in a manner that is very suitable for automated production (Ambrose: col. 1 lines 18-28).

Regarding claim 52, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the plurality of cutting heads are adapted to cut multiple sheets of the same shape oriented perpendicular to the direction of travel of the conveyor (col. 11 lines 26-27).

Regarding claim 53, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the platform is below the conveyor (130, 37, Figure 1).

Regarding claim 54, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the platform and conveyor are moveable relative each other to compress the stacked arrangement of discrete sheets between the platform and the conveyor to produce the packaging cushion insert (col. 7 lines 54-57).

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,730,817 (Feygin) in view of US Patent 4,596,111 (Ambrose) and in further view of ThomasNet: "Stainless Steel Waterjet Cutting Services" (ThomasNet).

Regarding claim 55, Feygin in view of Ambrose teaches that the one or more cutting heads may comprise a laser or a mechanical cutting knife (72, Figure 1; col. 5 lines 44-48). Feygin in view of Ambrose does not expressly disclose that said cutting heads comprise one or more water jet cutting heads. ThomasNet teaches using water jet cutting heads to cut die and laminated materials (pg. 2: Gardico, Inc. paragraph; pg. 3: Pegasus NW paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the water jet cutting heads of ThomasNet in order to modify the apparatus of Feygin in view of Ambrose. The rationale to do so would have been the motivation provided by the advantages to incorporating said water jet cutting heads; that said water jet cutting heads provide precise, accurate cuts, in even thick materials (ThomasNet: pg. 2: Pegasus NW paragraph, KV Technologies paragraph; pg. 4: Aqua Cut Technologies paragraph).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VICKI WU whose telephone number is (571)270-7666. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 am-6:30 pm), every other Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Del Sole can be reached on 571-272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V.W./
Patent Examiner, TC 1791

/Joseph S. Del Sole/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791